

12/22

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application, and stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Boothby et al. (USP 6,141,664).

Applicant respectfully believes that Boothby '664 does not address the same "inherited" data and consequentially does not disclose the same steps as claimed. Regarding claim 1, in section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that "Boothby teaches 'receiving a first user input, the first user input selecting a first data item from the second dataset for inheritance into the first dataset' at col. 5, lines 5-37, Fig. 4A-Step 150." The cited passage makes repeated references to user choices for setting preferences (11-14), performing scratch/incremental synchronization (15-25), selecting databases to be synchronized (26-27), and using a default/modified mapping (28-32). None of these user choices include ***"the first user input selecting a first data item from the second dataset for inheritance into the first dataset"*** as claimed. Neither selecting a first data item nor inheritance appear in the cited passage.

The Examiner further asserts that col. 6, lines 35-39 teach the placing step. The passage cited reads: "MappedLField flag indicates whether a field is mapped at all. The Synchronizer uses this flag to determine whether it should use the A+B\_Map or B+A\_Map to map this field. Unlike a No-Reconcile field, an unmapped field will not be carried along through the synchronization." A flag and a pointer ordinarily are much different. Applicant requests clarification as to how this passage relates to ***"placing a first pointer in the first dataset, pointing to a first record in the second dataset that contains the first data item."***

Still regarding claim 1, the Examiner points to col. 5, lines 25-37, col. 6, lines 35-39, as teaching the "when processing" step. These passages overlap with the passages discussed above. They do not make any reference to using a first pointer during processing of data, as a flag is not understood in the same sense as a pointer.

13/20

Applicant urges that none of the three steps of claim 1 are found in the cited passages of Boothby '664. Therefore, the claim should be allowable over the cited reference.

Regarding claim 14, in section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner correctly identifies col. 5, lines 5-38 as including processing of data in a first dataset, but there is no distinction in this passage between native and inherited data.

The Examiner suggests that col. 5, lines 21-38, which discusses field mapping, relates to inheritance from a second dataset. As Applicant reads this passage, Boothby is concerned with synchronization between two datasets, without regard to inheritance. In this application, inherited data has a sense that is distinct from native data. For instance, at page 43, lines 1-3, this application explains, "In the example sequence, the inheritance-aware synchronization method conducts a first synchronization in which it propagates (adds) an inherited record of the GUD into an alter-ego dataset for the first time." Pages 22-24 of the application further describe inheritance in terms of parent and child data sets, the child data set having alter egos with which it is synchronized. The cited passage of Boothby does not express any concept of inherited data, as distinct from a native data.

Next, the Examiner cites column 8, lines 3-33, with respect to processing data inherited from the third dataset. This passage is tied to FIG. 2, which depicts only two datasets, not three. No concept of inheritance is expressed in the cited passage. Applicant urges that none of the steps of claim 14 are found in the cited passages of Boothby '664. Therefore, the claim should be allowable over the cited reference.

Regarding claim 17, in section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner correctly identifies col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 15 as referring to a plurality of data in a first dataset, but there is no distinction in this passage between native and inherited data.

The Examiner suggests that col. 6, lines 35-39 relate to a first pointer pointing to a second dataset to inherit a first data item. Again, this passage relates to a flag. A pointer ordinarily refers to something different than a flag. In addition, the passage does not express any inheritance feature.

Next, the Examiner cites column 8, lines 3-33, with respect to a second pointer in the first dataset, pointing to a third pointer in a third dataset. Again, this passage is

14/25

tied to FIG. 2, which depicts only two datasets, not three. No concept of inheritance is expressed in the cited passage. The passage refers to three linkage words, data items 1-3, "Next\_In\_xx", pointing to a next member of the same Corresponding Item Group, a Same Key Fields Group and a Fanned Instances Group, respectively. It appears that each of the two datasets in FIG. 2 has its own Extended Index Array, so the "Next\_In\_xx" pointers form a linked list within a dataset, not a link from one dataset to another. The cited passage does not teach ***"a second pointer in the first dataset, the second pointer pointing to a third pointer in a third dataset, the third pointer pointing to a second data item in a fourth dataset to inherit the second data item from the third dataset into the first dataset on a record level, the second data item further being inherited from the fourth dataset into the third dataset on a record level"***.

Regarding the fourth pointer pointing to a fifth dataset, the Examiner cites col. 10, lines 56-65. This passage is tied to the pseudocode in FIG. 11, which refers to an A\_Record (456) and a B\_Record (455), but not to records from third, fourth or fifth datasets. Applicant requests the Examiner's assistance in understanding how the cited passage relates to a fourth pointer pointing to a fifth dataset.

The wherein step describes processing data that is native and inherited. The Examiner cites col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line 20, which relate to loading and sanitizing records from first and second datasets. The cited passage does not teach the element ***"wherein, when the system processes data in the first dataset, the system processes data that is native to the first dataset, along with the first data item, the second data item and data from the fifth dataset."*** In this claim element, the first data item is the second dataset and is inherited into the first; the second data item is in the third dataset and inherited from the fourth dataset; and there is a fifth dataset.

Applicant urges that none of the elements of claim 17 are found in the cited passages of Boothby '664. Therefore, the claim should be allowable over the cited reference.

15/20

Regarding claim 23, in section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner cites col. 5, lines 5-37. The cited passage makes repeated references to user choices for setting preferences (11-14), performing scratch/incremental synchronization (15-25), selecting databases to be synchronized (26-27), and using a default/modified mapping (28-32). None of these user choices include ***"receiving a first user input, the first user input selecting a first data item from a first ancestor dataset for inheritance into the first dataset"*** as claimed. This passage does not refer to an ancestor dataset or to inheritance.

The performing step of claim 23 draws the Examiner's citation of col. 6, lines 35-67. The antecedent basis for the first data item in this step is ***"a first data item from a first ancestor dataset for inheritance into the first dataset"***. The cited passage refers to an A\_Database, a B\_Database and history records, but not to an ancestor database (as opposed to an alter-ego database) or to inheritance. Applicant urges that none of the elements of claim 23 are found in the cited passages of Boothby '664. Therefore, all four of the independent claims should be allowable over the cited reference. All of the dependent claims also should be allowable, for at least the same reasons.

The Examiner turns, in section 7 of the Office Action, to the dependent claims. Claim 2 describes processing data responsive to a user's selection of data items for display. The Examiner addresses steps that use a filter to implement the selection, by citing passages generally including col. 5, line 5 through col. 6, line 67. This extended passage does not ever use the words "display" or "filter". The notion of a filter may be found in selecting a data range, at lines 42-55. However, Boothby's selection of a data range is for synchronization, not display. Boothby's date range is not applied to a first data item that is inherited. No first pointer is used by Boothby. Display of selected records is not mentioned in the extended passage. Therefore, claim 2 should be allowable over the cited reference.

In section 8, the Examiner addresses claim 3, citing col. 6, line 44 through col. 7, line 16. This claim includes steps relating to editing an inherited first data item. The antecedent basis for the first data item, from claim 1, is ***"a first data item from the second dataset for inheritance into the first dataset"***. The passage citation

16/20

here may be in error, as it does not match the beginning and end of paragraphs, as the Examiner's other citations generally do. The cited passage refers to the role of the history file and field translation information used for so-called fanning or other data translation of a recurring event. The cited passage does not include any third user input, any editing of data records according to input, or any concept of inheritance.

In section 9, the Examiner addresses claim 4, citing col. 8, lines 3-33. As Boothby does not appear to use pointers from one dataset to another, there is never a **"first pointer, pointing to the first record in the second dataset"** for the method to retain.

In section 10, the Examiner addresses claim 5, which depends from claims 1 and 3, and therefore was patentable for the same reasons as those claims. The Examiner cites column 8, lines 52-56 regarding making a **"local copy of the first item in the processing of data in the first data set."** The antecedent basis for the first data item, from claim 1, is **"a first data item from the second dataset for inheritance into the first dataset"**. Boothby's extended index, which is held resident in memory, is not a local copy of the first item.

In section 11, the Examiner addresses claim 6, citing Figure 4A, step 154, column 5, lines 25-37 and column 8, line 57 to column 9, line 8. The cited figure is pseudocode. It does not teach **"receiving a fourth user input, the fourth user input selecting a third dataset and indicating that the entire third dataset is to be inherited into the first dataset"**. The pseudocode obtains certain user preferences, none of which relate to a third data set or to inheritance. Line 154 of the pseudocode offers a choice between default and modified field mappings between a first and second dataset, which is not the same as indicating that an entire third data set is to be inherited. The cited passages do not refer to a second pointer pointing to a third data set or use of a second pointer in processing the first data set.

In section 12, the Examiner addresses claim 7, citing Figure 4A, step 161 and column 10, lines 21-38 and column 10, line 56 to column 11, line 20. Step 161 permits the user to modify a pre-existing field map. This is not the same as **"fifth user input selecting a second data item from the second dataset for inheritance**

17/20

**into the first dataset; wherein the second data item has been inherited from a fourth dataset into the second dataset, the second dataset including a fourth pointer to a second record in the fourth dataset that contains the second data item".** There is no reference in the figure to a fourth data set, a fourth pointer or inheritance. Applicant does not understand how reference in the cited passages to sanitizing, setting values for an extended index or loading records are considered by the Examiner to correspond to, **"placing a third pointer in the first dataset, pointing to the fourth pointer in the second dataset; and when processing data in the first dataset, using the third pointer to locate the fourth pointer, using the fourth pointer to locate the second data item, and including the second data item from the fourth dataset in the processing of data in the first dataset."**

Applicant does not find any reference in Boothby that relates to a chain of pointers across data sets.

In section 13, the Examiner addresses claim 8, citing Figure 4B, step 167 and column 13, line 57 to column 14 line 20. Step 167 of the pseudocode asks whether the user prefers incremental synchronization or synchronization from scratch. This does not correspond to, **"receiving a sixth user input, the sixth user input selecting the fourth dataset and indicating that the entire fourth dataset is to be inherited into the first dataset"**. Nothing in the cited passage relates to avoiding double inheritance of data, directly and through an intermediate data set.

In sections 14-16, the Examiner addresses claim 9 and claims 10-11, which further depends from claim 9, citing column 16, lines 1-45 and column 17, lines 1-9. Nothing in the cited passage refers to a first data set having data inherited from a second data set and adding the inherited data to a third, alter-ego data set. Applicant does not see anything in Boothby that corresponds to the distinction between a data set, from which data is inherited, and an alter-ego data set, with which data is synchronized.

In section 17, the Examiner addresses claim 12, citing figure 4B, step 172, column 17, lines 1-9, column 15, lines 3-38, column 16, lines 1-14, column 11, lines 21-28, column 16, lines 30-44, and figure 20. Step 172 in the pseudocode involves asking the user to choose to a date range for synchronization. This is not as the

18/20

same as receiving a "***seventh user input indicating a change to be made to the first data item***". Moreover, claim 12 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 9 and 10, from which it depends.

In section 18, the Examiner addresses claim 13, citing column 17, lines 10-31, column 15, lines 51-67, column 16, lines 1-14, column 22, lines 18-28 and column 22, lines 38-59. Applicant sees nothing in Boothby that involves simultaneous synchronization of a first, child data set with a second, parent data set and with a third of alter-ego data set.

In section 19, the Examiner addresses claim 15, citing column 10, lines 56-65. This claim is allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 14, from which it depends. Moreover, Applicant does not find any mention in Boothby of inherited data.

In section 20, the Examiner addresses claim 16, citing column 5, lines 43-54. This claim is allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 14, from which it depends. Moreover, the passage regarding establishment of an extended index has nothing to do with displaying records.

In section 21, the Examiner addresses claim 18, citing column 8, lines 3-33. Nothing in the cited passage suggests that a single data set can provide both inherited and synchronized data. Applicant finds nothing in Boothby that distinguishes between inherited and synchronized data.

In section 22, the Examiner addresses claim 19, citing column 10, line 66 to column 11, line 20. Applicant finds nothing in Boothby that addresses simultaneously updating a first data set with inherited data from a second data set, inherited data from a fourth data set through a third data set and inherited data from a fifth data set, and resolving a situation where the second/fifth data set is a single data set from which data is to be inherited at both the record and data set levels.

In section 23, the Examiner addresses claim 20, citing column 10, lines 6-20. Nothing in Boothby teaches avoiding updating a second data set, which may be a read-only data set.

In section 24, the Examiner addresses claim 21, citing column 10, lines 6-38. Nothing in Boothby teaches avoiding double inheritance.

19/20

In section 25, the Examiner addresses claim 22, citing column 13, lines 57-63. This claim involves a level of interaction among more than two data sets that is not found in Boothby.

In section 26, the Examiner addresses claim 24, citing column 8, lines 3-21, column 10, lines 6-20, column 8, lines 52-56 and column 7, lines 1-27. This claim involves a level of interaction among more than two data sets and distinctions between inherited and synchronized data that are not found in Boothby.

In section 27, the Examiner addresses claim 25, citing column 11, lines 21-28. The cited passage does not refer to making local copy of inherited data.

In section 28, the Examiner addresses claim 26, citing column 5, lines 5-37, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 16, lines 3-21, column 13, line 64 to column 14, line 20, column 10, lines 6-20, column 8, lines 52-56, column 15, lines 5-21 and column 22, lines 38-59. This claim involves a level of interaction among more than two data sets and distinctions between inherited and synchronized data that are not found in Boothby.

In section 29, the Examiner addresses claim 27, citing column 5, lines 25-37, column 10, lines 6-20, column 8, lines 52-56, column seven, lines 1-27, column 5, lines 5-37, column 8, lines 34-43, column 8, lines 3-21, column 11, lines 21-28 and column 22, lines 38-59. This claim involves a level of interaction among more than two data sets and distinctions between inherited and synchronized data that are not found in Boothby.

In section 30, the Examiner addresses claim 28, citing column 6, lines 35-39. The passage cited reads: "MappedLField flag indicates whether a field is mapped at all. The Synchronizer uses this flag to determine whether it should use the A+B\_Map or B+A\_Map to map this field. Unlike a No-Reconcile field, an unmapped field will not be carried along through the synchronization." A flag and a pointer ordinarily are much different. Applicant requests clarification as to how this passage relates to ***"placing a first pointer in the first dataset, pointing to a first record in the second dataset that contains the first data item."***

In section 31, the Examiner addresses claim 29, citing column 5, line 38 to column 6, line 16. This extended passage does not ever use the word "display".



20/20

Boothby's selection of a data range is for synchronization, not display. Boothby's date range is not applied to a first data item that is inherited. No first pointer is used by Boothby. Display of selected records is not mentioned in the extended passage.

Information Disclosure Statement

An Information Disclosure Statement is being mailed as of this date, using a Certificate of Mailing via First Class Mail.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as stated herein, are in condition for allowance and solicits acceptance of the claims, in light of these remarks. If the Examiner disagrees and sees amendments that might facilitate allowance of the claims, a call to the undersigned would be appreciated.

Should any questions arise, the undersigned can ordinarily be reached at his office at 650-712-0340 from 8:30 to 5:30 PST, M-F and can be reached at his cell phone 415-902-6112 most other times.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 24 October 2003

Ernest J. Beffel, Jr., Reg. No. 43,489

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP  
P.O. Box 366  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
(650) 712-0340 phone  
(650) 712-0263 fax

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 24 2003

OFFICIAL